STRUCTURING LEADERSHIP:

Alternative Models for Distributing Power and Decision-Making in Nonprofit Organizations

by CAROLINE MCANDREWS
FRANCES KUNREUTHER
SHIFRA BRONZNICK

BUILDING MOVEMENT PROJECT

The goal of the Building Movement Project is to build a strong social justice ethos into the nonprofit sector, strengthen the role of nonprofit organizations in the United States as sites of democratic practice, and promote nonprofit groups as partners in building a movement for progressive social change.

To accomplish its goals, the Building Movement Project makes use of four core strategies:

- Changing the discourse and practice within the nonprofit sector to endorse social change and social justice values.

- Identifying and working with social service organizations as sites for social change activities in which staff and constituencies can be engaged to participate in movement building.

- Supporting young leaders who bring new ideas and energy to social change work.

- Listening to and engaging people who work in social change organizations—especially grassroots and community-based groups—to strengthen their ability to shape the policies that affect their work and the communities they serve.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Caroline McAndrews is the Director of Leadership & Communications for the Building Movement Project, which she joined in 2004. She directs the Project's work on generational changes in leadership in addition to coordinating BMP communications, and is the author of *What Works: Developing Successful Multigenerational Leadership*. Prior to Building Movement, Caroline was a member of the economic security team at the Ms. Foundation for Women, where she provided funding, technical assistance, and networking opportunities to nonprofits across the country working with women to start small businesses, organize for workers' rights, and develop leadership in labor unions. Before working at Ms., she served as the IDA Program Coordinator for Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition, a low-income housing developer in Redwood City, California.

Frances Kunreuther directs the Building Movement Project, which works to strengthen U.S. nonprofits as sites of civic engagement and social change. She is co-author of *From the Ground Up: Grassroots Organizations Making Social Change* (Cornell, 2006) and *Working Across Generations: Defining the Future of Nonprofit Leadership* (Jossey Bass, 2008). Frances is also a senior fellow at the Research Center for Leadership and Action at New York University and spent five years at the Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations at Harvard University. She headed the Hetrick-Martin Institute for LBGT youth, and was awarded a year-long Annie E. Casey Foundation fellowship in 1997 for this and her previous work. Over the years, Frances has worked with homeless youth and families, undocumented immigrants, crime victims, battered women, and substance users. She is a writer and presenter on variety issues related to nonprofits, leadership, and social change.

Shifra Bronznick is a consultant to social change organizations. The President of *Advancing Women Professionals and the Jewish Community*, she is the co-author with Didi Goldenhar and Marty Linsky of the book, *"Leveling the Playing Field."* Shifra is the key investigator of *Visioning Justice*, an action research project commissioned by the Nathan Cummings Foundation to strengthen the field of Jewish social justice. A senior fellow at the NYU Research Center for Leadership in Action at the Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, she teaches strategic leadership in their Executive Masters in Public Administration program.

INTRODUCTION

For the past ten years the Building Movement Project has addressed leadership in the nonprofit sector by focusing on generational shifts, multigenerational leadership and new ways of leading. In each of these areas, the question we are most often asked by younger generations is whether we can provide them with new models of how to run/lead organizations that do not concentrate authority and responsibility in one top person. We believe these models exist but they are either unrecognized or embedded within traditional-looking hierarchies. We also believe that highlighting different leadership structures will offer organizations examples for effective ways to operate that can increase impact.

We set out to identify and document these models and while we did find some key examples, we did not find as many as we hoped. Innovation was more likely in smaller organizations where experimental structures are often easier to put into operation because bureaucracy and culture can be less entrenched or easier to adapt when fewer people are involved. In larger organizations (i.e. more than 10 staff members), alternative models were more difficult to find, and in some cases, they were strongly linked to the current leader, not to a structure that would last as different individuals moved into leadership positions.

Most research on leadership structures has been focused on the for-profit sector, where corporations have been experimenting with new models in an attempt to increase their productivity and competitiveness in a global market.[1] In the nonprofit sector, recent reports have pointed to the need to look at how leadership is enacted.[2] One particular nonprofit model we were repeatedly pointed towards to look for innovative leadership structures was the field of social entrepreneurship in which new ideas drive fast growth, innovation, and replication. These groups often excelled in leadership development, but leadership models often centered around a founder with an idea, rather than a collaborative or alternative model of operation. Social enterprises are very closely modeled after for-profit start-up ventures, in a similar way to many of the nonprofits started in the 1960's that were modeled after small corporations of the day.

To find other nonprofit examples, we developed an interview protocol that we vetted with leadership development consultants and others working with nonprofit organizations. Based on their responses and insights, we conducted an online survey that was completed by 112 organizations of varying size across the country.[3] The survey focused on organizational decision making as a way to identify "alternative structures".

We used the survey results, along with recommendations from partners in the field to interview a small group of organizations that were identified as having different structures. The interviews concentrated on decision-making practices, the role of leadership, and organizational structure, paying special attention to issues of age, race, gender, and class. These interviews, usually with one of the organization's key leaders, focused on how major decisions were made; the role of non-executive leadership, including independent goal-setting and control over work, budget, and program decisions; and the role of the board. We paid special attention to organizations with more than 10 staff members in order to find models that worked at larger scales. The findings below detail what we found, along with 3 case examples and a final list of questions we will continue to explore.

FINDINGS

While there were only a few organizations that met our initial criteria as having "alternative" operating models in our online survey and subsequent interviews, there emerged a typography of different decision-making structures that had developed as a pragmatic way to respond to the demands of their mission and to increase their impact.

We categorized these findings by stressing two different practices. **Shared leadership** describes a model in which the top level of executive leadership is shared internally by two or more people (for example, a co-directorship). **Distributed leadership** is a model in which there is one person in the executive role, but decision-making is consistently and methodically pushed down to other levels in the organization (for example, strong program directors). Each model had elements in common, and some groups operated in a way where leadership was both shared and distributed (for example, a project-based structure).

Across these models, there were certain key principles that we identified as indicative of distributed or shared leadership, even in those groups that appear to be traditionally hierarchical. Below, we present our findings by first exploring the foundations upon which to build distributed or shared leadership models. We then describe how to implement shared leadership practices, and finally we present indicators of the effectiveness of those practices. We end the paper with three case examples.

Foundations for Distributed Leadership

We investigated several different models of leadership, including strong senior management teams, independent project leadership, two or more co-directors, and constituent or client-led decision-making structures. Several themes arose which indicated that certain elements must be in place for alternative models to work, in order to move leadership out of the realm of the executive and to form the basis for strong systems of decision-making.

High levels of trust: Every person we interviewed brought up the issue of trust. Strong trust came up in two ways – as both necessary to operating within a distributive leadership structure, but also as a result of operating that way. In other words, the process of trusting people to make good decisions leads to further increased trust in the organization. This involves a high level of transparency as well, including around money and budgets which is not always a norm in nonprofit organizations.

Investment in learning: Each of our respondents pointed to the importance of investing resources in the learning and development of all staff in order to equip them to make informed decisions individually and to contribute to shared decision-making. While this might include leadership training and learning about the history of an issue, the mission and vision of both the organization and individual projects were also important. As one director put it, "Decision-makers need a high degree of information, and we need to have the people implementing programs involved, not others. All decision-makers have expertise and responsibilities." This came into play in vetting new hires as well.

Values are important: Almost all of our respondents spoke of the importance of not only values-based leadership, but also to the importance of *building a structure* that supports organizational values. Groups value sharing diverse ideas and opinions and including stakeholders and constituents. These led to models that provide mechanisms for learning and sharing on a daily basis.

Patience and Time: Approaching organizational structure in a new way requires patience and a commitment to see it through to the end. It also meant creating time in the organization for these activities. Initially these changes can mean investing in a process that could last several months, but respondents believe that the results lead to increased impact.

Implementing Shared Leadership Practices

To make the shift to a more de-centralized organizational model, those we interviewed took certain steps to implement new practices. While the outcomes differed, the participation of staff and board in the process was essential to creating the models that emerged, rather than changes being imposed inorganically.

Embrace autonomy: In most of our examples, executive leadership consciously made the decision to push decision-making down. Decisions are taken off the executive plate and put into the hands of staff. This is not an input model, but a decision-making practice that empowers staff to act independently. Along with this, organizations with strong models of distributed leadership decreased bureaucracy as much as possible. This included the board as well. In each of our examples, the board was actively involved in oversight and thought partnership, but trusted the staff to make the right decisions when it came to program and fund development.

> **"We are engaging more folks in leadership and it connects them in a more powerful way to the organization, so we are more effective. People who feel heard and valued stay in the organization. We don't want them to go anywhere. We have a high degree of continuity, with twenty staffers have been with organization over 10 years… and that gives us tremendous benefits—experience, knowledge, and relationships for organizing."**

Buy-in from staff: From the board to the receptionist, staff at all levels of the organization need to believe in the importance of engaging and see it as key to successful operation and impact. One of the challenges that arose for many of the respondents was that one person who is not committed can really derail the time and energy it takes to implement distributed leadership. The models that took the strongest hold were those that were supported across the board and not implemented from the top-down. In other words, while it is important for the executive director to let-go of some of his or her power, it is not enough to make that decision and implement it.

Share information: Decision-makers need a high level of information, and that takes time to share. All of our respondents struggled with finding efficient and thorough ways of sharing information that did not always involve face-to-face meetings. Several organizations noted that in order to share more information, staff needed to build their communication skills. One interviewee noted, "This process helped people to find their voice, build rapport and make more informed decisions."

Clarify roles: Defining clearly what people are responsible for helps to insure that things get done and there is accountability for the work. There is a difficult balance between the efficiency of distributive decision-making and the participation/inclusion required in order to make sure people have the information and tools they need for their jobs. Clarifying roles and clearly defining boundaries is important when pushing decision-making down. It creates the structures needed to implement work and create impact.

> "The charismatic CEO and hero social entrepreneur are in part created by the funding community. This means you don't have to kick the tires as much on the organization, you just have to buy into the leadership of the CEO. Do you need charismatic people to run food pantries? The degree to which we have fetishized leadership is a challenge. We are emphasizing communications, telegenics— rather than solid strategy."

Control only what we need to control: To truly embrace autonomy, the executive director or executive leadership *chooses not to execute their full operational control* as entitled to them by their position. In other words, they *could* step in and make decisions about certain organizational policies or practices (i.e. health care, program decisions, budget allocations), but consciously opt not to because they believe that they have better results and more impact by letting go. In fact, every organization we talked to with distributive models had solid but not controlling leadership. As one executive director put it, "I am a strong leader but not directive, so people know they are free to go do their stuff, but can still get direction from me if they get stuck."

Indicators of Success

While the styles of leadership varied widely across each of the models we looked at, we found common signs that distributed leadership was taking place.

Power to decide on programs, including raising funds: Overall, there are simply more decisions made by people other than the CEO/executive director. Program development is left to the power of directors or cases are taken on by the decision of legal staff, independent of the managing director or ED/CEO. Contrary to common wisdom, these groups saw benefits in more distributed decision-making that includes responsibility for raising and spending money. The level of autonomy varied among organizations we interviewed, but several insist that with well-defined roles, internal information-sharing, communication, and trust, fundraising and budgetary discretion can be highly distributed. Relationship building with funders can be driven by – as well as shape – program decisions. One executive director told us she has enormous trust that if staff members are seeking funds and are unsure about the program or financial implications, they will seek counsel from her or one of their peers. Similarly, staff is informed of current larger fundraising plans/efforts and can assist or hold off if necessary.

New ideas and innovation: One of the most immediate effects of implementing distributive models has been greater innovation and spreading of new ideas throughout the organization. Sharing information leads not only to more ideas, but also to faster internal communications systems so that

staff at all levels has immediate access to sharing ideas. On the flip-side, as we mention above, this occasionally slows things down in order to loop people back in.

More responsibility and responsiveness: Another benefit of these models was that staff and/or directors at all levels could see the tangible results of taking more responsibility not only externally but also internally. As the case studies point out, many groups turned to staff committees or program directors to determine internal policies and how to pay for them. These might include retirement saving accounts, health insurance, appropriate work hours and flex time, and so on. As a result, there was more ownership in the decision and the results.

"Our previous leader was an icon so people did not see our strength. At a recent event, one of our core funders leaned over to us and said, "Wow, you have such a deep bench, I didn't realize this."

Increased and diverse external representation: Staff members at various levels of power within the organization are able to freely speak and interact with outside partners, media contacts, and funders, without prior consultation with the executive management. One organizational head told us that the by not centralizing communications, the programs in his organization were mentioned more times than any comparable organization in his region. He attributed this to his not having to control the messaging.

Greater impact: The most important indicator for respondents is having greater impact in their work such as growing programs, maintaining talent, raising more funds, addressing new issues, or creating new partnerships to scale their work. One executive director expressed surprise that the organization's distributive model of leadership – which had clearly been effective – was barely recognized by colleagues in the field or funders.

Challenges

There were some key challenges that arose when new models were put in place. These included:

Delicate balance: As described earlier under "Buy-in from staff," operating in a new ways involves more responsibility from all staff members. This expectation can be especially difficult in organizations that are shifting from a model where staff has been told what to do to a model where staff is asked to define and complete the tasks needed to advance the organization. Offering support and information for staff to make this transition is crucial. However, when one or two people are not on board, they can impede the operation. As one respondent put it, "One bad hire can damage the whole system."

Accountability: As more people in an organization have power to make decisions, it can lead to less certainty about who has the "final say" or who's responsible for moving work forward. If there is not a clear lead, goals and timelines may slip. Similarly, if a difficult decision needs to be made and there is no clear lead, confusion and resentment can build up when a final decision is made either by executive level leadership or other staff.

Hard to be nimble: Somewhat ironically, while the models we found tend to lead to more creativity and ideas floating to the surface, when combined with the type of internal communication needed, some organizations found it hard to respond as quickly to emerging trends, or to change direction in their work as quickly as in a highly centralized organization. However, interviewees all said their work is more effective this way, leading to more impact as their decisions tend to be better informed and closer to the ground.

Key Cases for Learning

We focused on three organizations with varying models of leadership and organizational structure to give a more detailed view of how decisions are made and how distributed or shared leadership looks in practice. Several of the findings above are expressed in practice below. We've included an organizing group, an intermediary technical assistance organization, and a legal services agency to illustrate how these concepts take hold in varying structures.

MAKE THE ROAD NEW YORK

Make the Road New York is an organizing group that catalyzes change for low-income New Yorkers by working in five impact areas to transform individual lives and bring about broad-based policy change at the city, state and national levels. The organization is led by three co-directors, as well as two deputy directors. The organization is the result of a merger between an organization with two co-directors and another organization with one executive director. These three leaders now form a tri-directorate. The organization has a budget of $8 million dollars and about 70 full-time staff (108 people total). The three co-directors are responsible for separate areas of work and overall the organization pushes decision-making to the program directors. When asked about the evolution of their leadership structure, one director observed that in some ways it was about growth, but it also had to do with "engaging more folks in leadership, which connects them in a

"Probably ten years ago we started looking at alternative leadership models; we were motivated by our clients. We had a discussion session with Native American leaders—a member of our Board of Directors is Cherokee and he was telling us there are other ways to lead."

more powerful way to the organization. So in the end, [they're] more effective." This connection to the organization has revealed itself in many ways, but the main result is that staff members tend to stay for a long time, which builds a deep bench of knowledge throughout the organization.

At Make the Road, giving decision-making power to those working closest to the ground is seen as key to increasing the effectiveness and impact of the organization. Many staff members are former and current community members who came to the organization through one of its various organizing campaigns. An example of how many dynamic participatory bodies interact as a result is seen in a recent process that involved how the organization decided to deal with work hours, overtime, salaries, and exempt/non-exempt status:

Sustainability is a major issue at the organization. 95% of our staff describes themselves as very or totally committed to the work and the organization, but at the same time 75% of our staff describes their work as exhausting and overwhelming. We made a bunch of plans in our strategic planning process in order to address this, and one of them was to look at job descriptions and try to come up with descriptions that match a reasonable work week.

In addition to the management team, we have a personnel committee made up of seven members of the staff, along with the three co-ED's. Everybody wanted to create equity, but there was disagreement between the management and the personnel committee. In the end, we ceded control to the staff-led personnel committee. Having all these bodies have ownership and a forum for ideas and solutions allowed us to get buy-in and something that was workable. It also feels manageable.

There are challenges to this model as well. Such intense involvement from staff at all levels has further added to the sense of burnout. Keeping everyone informed means having a lot of meetings. In addition, the organization has far-reaching goals shared by staff and constituents that previously have had little power. They have demonstrated impressive success. However, the director we interviewed made the connection between the time it took to make sure people were up to speed and the challenges they faced by outside powerful forces. "The

"As co-directors we are functioning as partners. A woman on our board who runs a successful for-profit marketing firm, says she has always worked in a partnership even though the firm is incorporated in her name. This type of structure happens much more in business."

cost of not meeting can be that people do not have the information they need to have to make good decisions. People complain there is too much work, but this has to do with the power of the organization in communities more than the way we structure our work – our power vis-à-vis our ambition and goals."

Another challenge for the organization is being clear about who is responsible. "If there is not a clear driver, it can slow things down and there can be a way that everyone lets themselves not meet the deadlines." Mutual responsibility is good in the sense that it can reinforce productive behavior, but staff can also reinforce unproductive behavior if no one person is responsible when a goal is not met.

Make the Road will most likely continue to adapt their structure as they grow, seeking to have maximum input from staff at all levels. It is important to note the way in which the executive level team defers to staff decisions. They have the power to make decisions themselves, but actively relinquish it.

COMPASSPOINT NONPROFIT SERVICES

CompassPoint Nonprofit Services is a management support organization focused on increasing the impact of nonprofit community-based organizations and the people who work and volunteer in them. Their goal is to intensify the impact of fellow nonprofit leaders, organizations, and networks to achieve social equity. One of their senior project directors describes their structure as a distributed leadership model that includes a team approach to program development. There is one Executive Director, but

program heads are given autonomy regarding program decisions, income generation, and building project teams across program area and staff level. This structure has developed steadily since the organization began. There have been two executive directors in the past twenty years, and both have leaned towards diffusion of decision-making power. As the project director we interviewed put it, "It is kind of in the bones of CompassPoint and it is maturing. As an organization focused on leadership development, it is inherently in our nature. We are students of this work while simultaneously working with our clients as they develop their own leadership approaches." The organization has 25 mostly full-time staff.

CompassPoint shares a similar philosophy as Make the Road New York in terms of empowering those closest to the work when it comes to making decisions. One example of how this operates in practice came out in a planning process where they developed a Theory of Change for the organization, which defines their focus of change, areas of impact, and strategies to achieve those changes. This collaborative process was staff-led with deep board participation including in the architecture of the process. One of the staffers called the development of the Theory of Change iterative. Drafts went back and forth between the board and the staff, as opposed to a process that is led by the board and management and engages staff at certain points. Here are some other points made by the staff member:

There were several elements that made this work:

- **Trust –** I felt as a staff member that I was trusted, as was everybody in the organization; that we could participate thoughtfully and equitably. Of course there were struggles, for example, we debated the definition of one of our core values extensively until everyone felt comfortable that it sufficiently illustrated our intent. Everyone was heard; they trusted that everybody's opinion mattered, and if something was bothering you about a decision, they really wanted you to bring it up.

- **Patience –** A participatory process takes longer, and there were times we got fatigued. The management team and all of us on staff had the patience and trust that we would get it done even though it took a long time.

- **Learning –** There was an investment made in learning so that everyone could participate. If you don't understand what is being discussed, then not everyone can participate. With a consultant, we first went through an orientation so that everyone understood the purpose of a Theory of Change and how we would be using it. Otherwise not everyone could be a true participant, versus a token person in the conversation.

This example is only one of many that exemplifies how decision-making is distributed in the organization. A key piece to pushing this decision-making down is that executive leadership does not use all the power they technically have: "Management can trump our decisions but they don't. It is a very collaborative environment, management is genuinely influenceable and we have a sharing atmosphere."

The CompassPoint example highlights another key element that we heard from almost all of the organizations with successful models of distributed leadership: boards that are not inappropriately controlling. In the case of CompassPoint, this does not mean relinquishing governing and oversight responsibilities, but rather collaborating with staff whose expertise is deeply valued. The shared

leadership that developed between staff and board during the Theory of Change process has continued to the next phase of work which involves designing and adopting evaluation systems for measuring impact. This will go beyond traditional reports to a board that are orchestrated by the executive director. Instead, different staff members are already engaged in the ongoing evaluation of organizational impact and will be expected to interact with the board.

Key challenges in this model include when and how to share information. For example, our interviewee pointed out, "It is ironic. Because we are collaborative and practice components of shared leadership, we do have a certain challenge. At our monthly staff meetings it is difficult to design an agenda that is relevant for everyone on staff. All the staff is required to attend because we value input from all parts of the organization, yet not all staff have the same knowledge or experience on all topics. We are in the midst of trying to figure out how to balance efficiency and valuing everyone's contribution."

This model doesn't look that different from a traditionally hierarchical model. "We are in the middle of the spectrum from traditionally hierarchical to a collective—though lean more towards the collective end of the spectrum." Our interviewee pointed out that the best model for each organization will arise when it is based in organizational values. CompassPoint spent a lot of time when working on their Theory of Change defining their values and how that shows up in their work.

URBAN JUSTICE CENTER

The Urban Justice Center is a legal service organization run on a project-based model with shared leadership at the senior level. As described on their website, "the projects are part of a unique organizational structure intended to foster creativity, excellence and ultimately meaningful results. The system requires the Project Directors to raise their own budgets in exchange for the freedom to direct and operate their Project as they see fit. The extraordinary level of autonomy has led to an unparalleled sense of ownership, translating to heightened motivation, risk taking, visionary thinking and general excellence." The organization has a staff of 70 and an overall budget of almost 7 million dollars. The organization was founded in the 1990s by executive director Doug Ladson who noticed that legal aid lawyers were not allowed to take on cases or projects they wanted because they were controversial, "unwinnable" or not in line with legal aid's mission. Wanting to fill this gap, Doug also believed that money would best be raised by the people who were most passionate about the work so he decided that if people with a passion for individual projects could raise the money, Urban Justice Center would house them. They use this model to build advocacy campaigns that seek to address systemic causes of the problems their clients face.

In order to increase the scope and impact of the organization, each project has a Project Director who is responsible for raising his or her own budget. In return *they receive complete freedom for who they hire, which cases they take on, what their advocacy goals are and what their advocacy methods will be.* Doug runs the executive office, which consists of developing new projects and raising money for overhead costs (a portion of this also comes from Project budgets). There is one central board; however, decision-making on all internal policy is made by a senior management team that consists of all the Project Directors. New or developing projects are represented by the executive director.

Since there is so much overall autonomy, the practice of shared leadership or decision-making at

Urban Justice Center focuses on joint issues, often related to new programs or infrastructure. This is illustrated by a story the executive director told about a periodic discussion they have around health-care coverage:

> The project directors meet twice a month and make decisions about all kinds of administrative matters – from summer outings to who gets what office. We are not just an umbrella. Everyone feels a strong loyalty and concern for the UJC. It can be equated to a university – they have academic freedom; we have advocacy freedom.

> We just did insurance and the group made a decision that I disagree with: we don't charge anyone for insurance, including families. I wanted to charge the families in addition to not covering partners who have other insurance options available and give the money we saved towards more pension coverage. But the directors wanted it to be as is, and so it is "as is."

> There are some key challenges to this model as well. People outside the organization, both funders and other executive leaders, first react to this leadership model with fear and a desire to control it. The executive director often has to defend the effectiveness of this method. For example, the public image of the organization is basically in the hands of Project Directors. Doug does not control the message or who speaks to outside sources. He loves when he opens up the newspaper and reads about a law suit UJC is involved in that he did not know about – a situation that most executive leaders dread. In order for this model to work, a willingness to let go and not attempt to control every decision, or public comment, is necessary. However, it means that explaining to funders why they should support the organization, and who makes decisions, requires more time and demonstrated results.

> This autonomy points to another challenge: trust must be developed among staff and partners. As Doug observes, this means that "being smart and effective is not good enough. You have to get along with peopleOne person not on board with the model can cause real problems, which has been a challenge at times for UJC.

CONCLUSION

Our purpose in seeking to highlight existing alternative models is to focus on increasing organizational impact. Our interest was to find operating structures that address potential barriers to effectiveness, including the growing demands on executives running nonprofits, the current realities of a multigenerational workforce where older leaders will stay longer, and the expectations and work style of new generations coming into the workplace with a strong team orientation. Research, demand and anecdotal evidence points to the need to lift up new ideas for leading organizations, but nonprofit examples have not been systematically documented. This paper is an attempt to begin that process and to focus attention on the changes that are happening within organizations.

What we identified was less alternative organizational charts and more foundational work and practices

that promote different leadership structures. The foundations – trust, learning, values and time – are key in developing healthy and productive work environments. Practices such as embracing autonomy, creating buy-in from staff and board members, sharing information, clarifying roles and letting go of control could be taught and reinforced in leadership training including with boards of directors. Finally, the point of sharing leadership is to have more success in our work, both internally and externally.

We believe we have made a first step in this direction and as new ideas and models emerge we are anxious to hear about what others are finding. Recent conversations on structures that take into account how younger leaders in the social sector want to lead and how Boomer-age leaders want to adjust their leadership roles push us to look beyond our comfort zone of how organizations have operated to date.

Key questions and observations that we think should be explored moving forward include:

- The field needs a more rigorous language and understanding of what we mean by shared leadership, distributed leadership, and alternative leadership models.

- For a variety of reasons, we found that models that counter traditional structures often exist within traditional structures. How do we highlight and spread these practices as part of leadership development?

- Is there a way to draw out strong leadership pieces that increase impact that go beyond alternative models? For example:

    o High levels of trust between all layers (board, directors, staff)

    o Program directors who are given the skills and autonomy to make decisions

    o Executive directors who were strong leaders but were not controlling leaders

While we found many interesting cases described throughout this paper, we are hoping to identify even more organizations with models that have been in practice for several years at least. In addition, we also hope to document emerging models as well to see if we can identify early indicators of success.

Additional areas that we would like to explore include:

- The role of the Board: It was asserted by many of the people we interviewed that the Board really allows the professionals in the organization to have the major voice on decisions. We wonder if board members would say the same.

- Accountability: The whole issue of accountability – both what we mean by it and what it looks like in practice – will be important to define moving forward.

- Handling conflict: To date, we are missing examples of how big conflicts are handled, especially when the staff disagrees with the ED/CEO on something that is important to him or her.

NOTES

1. Such as "The paradox of postheroic leadership: An essay on gender, power, and transformational change" by Joyce Fletcher in *The Leadership Quarterly* 15 (2004) 647–661; "When Two (or More) Heads are Better than One: The Promise and Pitfalls of Shared Leadership" by James O'Toole, Jay Galbraith, and Edward E. Lawler III in *California Management Review* Vol. 44, No. 4 Summer 2002 65-83; and *Co-Leaders: The Power of Great Partnerships* by D. Heenan and W. Bennis (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1999).

2. For examples, see "Doing More with More: Putting Shared Leadership into Practice" by Michael Allison, MBA, Susan Misra, MPA, and Elissa Perry, reprinted in the Nonprofit Quarterly, Summer 2011 (http://www.tccgrp.com/pdfs/180206_Reprint.pdf); and *Forces for Good: The Six Practices of High-Impact Nonprofits*, by Leslie Crutchfield and Heather McLeod Grant. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2007) (http://www.forcesforgood.net)

3. All major nonprofit journals were reviewed for relevant literature, along with nonprofit and for-profit management journals. 10 Organizational Development and Leadership consultants were then interviewed before designing the survey, which was distributed to 5,000 BMP contacts, as well as 3 partner distribution lists, with a total of 112 responses. Finally, 9 organizations were interviewed in depth following the survey, with 3 organizations selected for mini case-studies.

Building Movement Project

Inspiring Activism in the Nonprofit Community

220 Fifth Avenue
2nd Floor
New York, NY 10001
buildingmovement.org